Ridgeon, L. (2016) Reading Sufi history through ādāb: The perspectives of Sufia, Jawānmardān and Qalandars. In: Chiabotti, F., Feuillebois-Pierunek, E., Mayeur-Jaouen, C. and Patrizi, L. (eds.) Ethics and Spieriuality in Islam. Series: Islamic literatures: texts and studies (1). Brill: Leiden, pp. 379-402. ISBN 9789004335097.

Reading Sufi history through *ādāb:* The perspectives of Sufis, Jawānmardān and Qalandars

Lloyd RIDGEON, University of Glasgow

Introduction

Ādāb in the classical Islamic tradition defies a simple and single definition, as the term denoted a range of different forms of conduct and ideals.[1] Sufis of this period, typified by Abū Naṣr al–Sarrāj (d. 378/998), were well aware of this problem and sought a solution by delineating a tripartite classification of *ādāb* in which the Sufi perspective and model was established and contrasted with others; there were *ādāb* for worldly people, for the people of religion (*ahl al–dīn*) and for the select ones of religion (the Sufis).[2] Despite this endeavour to narrow the classification of *ādāb* into three groups, the attempt to reduce even Sufi *ādāb* to its bare essentials was problematic, which is illustrated in the words of Abū Ḥafṣ al–Nīshapūrī as cited by Sulamī (d. 412/1021): "Sufism is made up entirely of *ādāb*; for each moment there is [an appropriate] *ādāb*, for each spiritual station there is [an appropriate] *ādāb*."[3] The magnitude of attention demanded by Sufi *ādāb* must have conditioned the very essence of the individual and in effect, Sufi *ādāb* comprised ideal conduct, externally among fellow seekers and in the world at large, and also internally in respect to correct thoughts, attitudes and reflections towards others and to God. To further illustrate the problem of attaining to this ideal, it is instructive to reflect upon the deconstruction of *ādāb* made by other Sufis, such as Ibn ʿAṭāʾ (d. 309/921–2) who observed that "violating the rules of proper behaviour amidst its upholders is itself [a sign] of proper behaviour," or upon the assertion of Junayd (d. 298/910) that "when one's love [of God] is true, the rules of proper behaviour fall away."[4]

Yet an investigation of Sufi *ādāb*, notwithstanding the difficulties in defining the term mentioned above, offers historians a way to comprehend developments in the Sufi tradition. As in most socio–religious movements, the rules for correct behaviour often mirror changes in the larger contexts, be they political, social, economic or otherwise. This essay will attempt to demonstrate that a careful reading of Sufi literature reveals the following dialectic movement in the tradition.[5] The starting point is the thesis of Sufi apologetics, which is challenged by the antithesis of alternatives and alterity within the tradition that finally results in a synthesis of accommodation. This theory is not applicable to the whole of the Sufi movement, rather, it is a speculative attempt to relate

---

1 The term has been defined in scholarly sources in a similar fashion. For example, Khaleghi–Motlagh in his article "Adab" in *EIr*, states "*adab* in Persian means education, culture, good behaviour, politeness, proper demeanour; thus it is closely linked with the concept of ethics." Ohlander ("Adab, in Sufism", *EI3*) observes "Adab in Sufism includes the exposition, delimitation, and interpretation of rules and norms pertaining to individual conduct, social etiquette, and spiritual comportment." Similarly Metcalf ("Introduction," *Moral conduct and authority,* 4) states that it denotes "correct order, behaviour, and taste. It implicitly or explicitly distinguishes cultivated behaviour from that deemed vulgar."

2 Sarrāj, *Kitāb al–lumaʿ fī l–taṣawwuf,* 195. Compare with Hujwīrī, *Kashf al–maḥjūb*, 491.

3 *Ṭabaqāt al–ṣūfiyya*, 119.

4 *Qushayri's epistle on Sufism*, 295–6.

5 Sufi literature is vast, but this essay investigates works on Sufi *ādāb*, manuals of Sufism, and associated Sufi literature of specific Sufi groups in the classical period from the fourth/tenth century through to the early pre–modern era of the eleventh/seventeenth century.

sober and *sharīʿa*–minded Sufism with developments leading to a more popular and inclusive tradition, which provoked alternative forms of Sufi expression that were frowned upon by some of those within the "normative" camp.[6] Pressure from various socio–political and religious forces persuaded adherents of alternative forms of Sufism to return to the "mainstream" and conform to the more acceptable manifestations of the tradition. A summary of this dialectic is presented below:

(i). Apologetics

The early period of Sufism is typified by a very general concept of *ādāb* which could easily apply to any person wishing to live an inner, spiritual life. In effect, it was a form of Sufi apologetics that was designed to create a space for Sufism within "normative" Islamic observance.[7] This kind of Sufism continued as mainstream, sober Sufism into the medieval and post–Mongol period.

(ii). Alternatives and Alterity

The eleventh–thirteenth centuries witnessed a number of changes in the Sufi tradition which were partly due to the increasing fragmentation of political power. These included the institutionalisation of the *khānqāh*, political manipulation between Sufis and secular rulers, and the increasing levels of popular participation within the Sufi movement that culminated in the synthesis of Sufism with the tradition of *futuwwa*. Consequently, in the thirteenth century there was the emergence of what Karamustafa calls "deviant dervishes" which was a reaction to both sober Sufism and the popularisation of the tradition.[8]

(iii). Accommodation

It is the third stage that is perhaps the weakest link in the hypothesis because it rests upon rather circumscribed evidence. It is to be hoped that future research will determine the extent to which this model is correct. However, at present the hypothesis argues that as a result of socio–political forces some of the deviant dervishes reverted to a form of normative Sufism, and their rituals and practices became sanitised and domesticated.

Apologetics

Abū Naṣr al–Sarrāj was one of the first Sufis to compose a comprehensive manual of Sufism that elaborated on Sufi history, beliefs, expressions and practices. His *Kitāb al–lumaʿ fī l–taṣawwuf* is of particular interest for our study because of its twelve books, the seventh is devoted to the *ādāb* of Sufi rituals, including chapters pertaining to the devotions incumbent on all Muslims, and those which are more usually associated with the Sufi tradition, such as the *samāʿ*, specific forms of clothing, seclusion, travelling, and

---

6 By sober and *sharīʿa*–minded Sufism I refer to Sufis who were devout and assiduous in performing Islamic rituals, who refrained from prohibited acts such as drinking wine or eating pork, and observed the necessary conditions for conducting Sufi rituals such as the *samāʿ*. These Sufis were also cautious about the terms and words that they used to describe God, and avoided the more ecstatic forms of expression.

7 It should be noted that the Sufi works of this nature were not entirely apologetic, but were also "consolidations of Sufi teachings that had hither–to–fore been scattered". See Khalil, "Abū Ṭālib al–Makkī & *the Nourishment of Hearts* (*Qūt al–qulūb*) in the context of early Sufism," 342–4.

8 Karamustafa, *Deviant dervishes*

the *ādāb* for Sufis who are engaged in work, who are married and have children, *ādāb* relating to hunger, sickness and death.[9] It is of note that the *ādāb* for shaykhs and for the beginner and disciple (*murīd*) occupy only two chapters, a significance that becomes evident in subsequent centuries when the *shaykh–murīd* relationship assumes far greater importance in the Sufi manuals.[10] Another crucial aspect of his work was the tripartite division of *ādāb*: the *ādāb* for worldly people included eloquent speech, learning wisdom, the stories of kings, Arabic poetry and acquiring the knowledge of trades; the emphasis of the *ādāb* of the religious people was on both religious ritual performance and correct inner attitudes; this is then contrasted with the *ādāb* of the select (the Sufis) which was primarily related to perfection in inner attitudes (the inference being that this is in addition to the formal religious observance).[11]

Sarrāj's perspective on *ādāb* became the normative sober Sufi worldview, and this was further propounded by 'Abd al–Raḥmān al–Sulamī whose *Jawāmīʿ ādāb al–ṣūfiyya* was probably the first single treatise composed by a Sufi on the theme of Sufi *ādāb.* Sulamī portrayed correct behaviour in such a fashion that any individual interested in leading a pious and spiritual life would have benefitted from the work.[12] In his introduction he admitted that he wanted to reveal the truth about the Sufis in response to the criticism of individuals which was based upon their ignorance of Sufi customs.[13] The short work elaborates mainly on correct spiritual attitudes; indeed, there is little that is related to specific "Sufi" rituals and practice. Sulamī's treatise should be understood in the context of competing spiritual movements in his own time and geographical location, including the Karrāmiyya and the Malāmatīyya (whom Sulamī incorporated into the general Sufi movement).[14]

Within a generation or so after the composition of Sulamī's treatises, the *Kashf al–maḥjūb* was set out by Hujwīrī (d. c. 465/1072). He did not address *ādāb* in such a specific fashion as found in the works of his Sufi predecessors, however, his manual does clarify how there were some within Sufi circles who perceived of *ādāb* in a non–homogenous fashion. This is clear in his anecdote between the Malāmatī Ḥamdūn Qaṣṣār (d. 271/884–5) and a brigand (*ʿayyār*) named Nūḥ. The anecdote does not use the term *ādāb*, rather correct behaviour is rendered by the Persian word *jawānmardī* (or young manliness) which is the equivalent of the Arabic term *futuwwa*:

> [Ḥamdūn Qaṣṣār said], Nūḥ was the name of a brigand, well–known for his *futuwwa* [...] One day I saw him in the street and I asked [him], "What is *jawānmardī*?" He replied, "Are you asking about my *jawānmardī* or yours?" I said, "Tell me about both." He said, "My *jawānmardī* is that I cast aside this robe of mine and I wear the patched [Sufi] gown and act in a way that accords with it so that I may become a Sufi, and in that garment I refrain from committing sin out of shame before the people. Your *jawānmardī* is that you cast aside the patched [Sufi] gown so that you will not be deceived by people and they will not be deceived by you. So my *jawānmardī* is the protection of the *sharīʿa* by making something clear, and your *jawānmardī* is the protection of the *ḥaqīqa* by protecting secrets."[15]

---

9 Sarrāj, *Kitāb al–lumaʿ*, 194–282.

10 On this topic see two contrasting articles: Meier, "Khurāsān and the end of classical Sufism," 189–219, and Silvers–Alario, "The teaching relationship in early Sufism," 69–97.

11 Sarrāj, *Kitāb al–lumaʿ*, 195.

12 Sulamī, *A collection of Sufi rules of conduct*.

13 Sulamī, *A collection of Sufi rules of conduct*, 2.

14 Sulamī composed a treatise on the Malāmatīyya which is a mine of information on the topic. It has been translated into French by Roger Deladrière, under the title *La lucidité implacable.*

15 Hujwīrī, *Kashf al–maḥjūb*, 278.

The anecdote reveals the tension that existed between formal "Sufi" observance of *ādāb* and the Khurāsānī Malāmatī desire to forego such rigid regulations. Ḥamdūn Qaṣṣār's *jawānmardī* transcends Sufi *ādāb*, thereby incurring blame from those around him. He conceals his true spirituality by refraining from public performance of Sufi rituals, avoiding spiritual hypocrisy, and at the same time his *nafs* is belittled by the censure of others for not engaging in such activities. Although it has already been noted that Sulamī cited the Malāmatī Abū Ḥafṣ Nishapūrī to the effect that "Sufism is *ādāb,*"[16] his words do not necessarily convey approbation, rather, they may be taken as a stinging indictment of external manifestations of spirituality. Hujwīrī expressed circumspect of the Malāmatī position, highlighting the danger of individuals abandoning the law and deliberately committing an irreligious act, and then defending their actions with recourse to the Malāmatī path. He remarked that there were many individuals in his own time who engaged in such a practice.[17] The Malāmatī view of Sufi *ādāb* then was one that had to be treated with extreme caution.[18] The existence of such a perspective demonstrates that the tendency to alternatives and alterity was present within the Islamic world even before the twelfth–thirteenth centuries when the Qalandars appeared.

The association of the brigand (mentioned by Hujwīrī in the anecdote cited above) with Sufism introduces another intriguing feature in the development of Sufism, namely the connection between the spiritual *ādāb* of the Sufis and those of "worldly people" such as the *ʿayyār* who have frequently been linked with the tradition of *futuwwa* which has been associated with urban corporate associations and attributes such as *muruwwa* (a term almost synonymous with *futuwwa*).[19] This connection is apparent in the following citation from Hujwīrī, who also echoes Sarrāj's tripartite classification of *ādāb* in the following fashion:

> *Ādāb* in worldly relations (*mardumī*) is guarding manliness (*muruwwa*), and within religion it is guarding [the prophetic] tradition (*Sunna*) and within love (*maḥabba*) it is guarding [the Truth's] greatness (*ḥurma*). They are all connected to each other for whoever has no manliness is not a follower of the prophetic tradition, and whoever does not protect the prophetic tradition does not honour [the Truth's] greatness.[20]

What is clear in Hujwīrī's brief comments relating to *ādāb* is that like Sarrāj and Sulamī there is nothing overtly mystical (that is, it is not connected with ontological union or the more controversial notion of *ḥulūl*), rendering the concept safe from accusations of innovation or heresy.

---

[16] See note 3.

[17] Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 89–90.

[18] The disappearance of the Malāmatīs is probably due to their distaste for disseminating their beliefs in the form of teaching manuals, and disguising their true motives. The writing down of such ideas by the Malāmatīs may have been considered reprehensible because of the danger that it would nurture intellectual pride. Yet it must surely have limited the propagation of the movement. In addition, their apparent "disregard" for the *sharīʿa* would certainly not have endeared them to alternative forms of Islamic spirituality. On the Malāmatīs see Sviri, "Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the Malāmatī movement in early Sufism," 583–613. See also Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū dar taṣawwuf-i Irān*, 335–57, and Chabbi, "Remarques sur le développement historique des mouvements ascétiques et mystiques au Khurasan," 5–72.

19 Karamustafa, *Sufism*, 65–6.

[20] Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 491.

Thus far, the Sufis highlighted in this essay have recognised the range of *ādāb*, and the literature also provides evidence of a concern with *ādāb* and its association with *futuwwa*. Just as it is necessary to be cautious when discussing *ādāb* within the Sufi and spiritual traditions, so too *futuwwa* demands clarification due to its diverse forms. In the early period of Islamic history, when the term was not associated with Sufism, there were various manifestations of *futuwwa*. Linkages have been made between *futuwwa* and groups of young men who enjoined hedonist parties, with the Shuʿubiya movement that was concerned with the promotion of the Persian language, and with groups of brigands some of whom probably lived on the margins of society (and others who formed localised urban gangs).[21] The diverse nature and *raison d'être* of these associations render it problematic to witness a particular *futuwwa ādāb*. However, it may be speculated that it was the *ʿayyār*, the brigand, with his ethic of individual courage and bravery, loyalty to the group, selflessness and generosity that provided an inspiration for emerging generations of more spiritually inclined individuals.

A similar perspective to the Sufi tripartite classification of *ādāb* was offered in the *Qābūs-nāma* (a treatise started in 460/1082–3), which uses the term *jawānmardī* (the Persian equivalent of *futuwwa*) as a semantic synonym for *ādāb*. The *Qābūs-nāma* presents an idealised brigand through a discussion of *jawānmardī* and also constructs a hierarchy of excellence for "manliness". Brigands, soldiers and merchants were exponents of *jawānmardī* in worldly relations[22]; the ideal brigand is described as manly, forbearing in all tasks, sexually pure, not causing anyone harm to benefit himself, speaking truthfully and granting justice. The ideal brigand deserves the descriptor *jawānmard* because of his excellence in worldly relations (*mardumī*). Above the brigands, soldiers and merchants in the social hierarchy of the *Qābūs-nāma* are the Sufis, who are bettered by the wise men and prophets, and the highest rank in *jawanmardī* is possessed by the *rūḥāniyān*, or spiritual beings. It is easy, therefore, to see how the brigand's attributes dovetailed neatly into a Sufi or spiritual worldview, and why *jawānmardī* became an important character trait that was the subject of interest for Sufis.

It is of interest that one of the first Sufi discussions of *futuwwa* occurs in the *Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn* where Manṣūr Ḥallāj (d. 309/922) appropriated the term to portray his faithfulness, loyalty and selflessness before God.[23] However, it was not until the next century that *futuwwa* was analysed regularly in the Sufi manuals. Perhaps the best example of this is a short treatise by Sulamī entitled *Kitāb al-futuwwa* in which the emphasis is primarily on *ādāb*, that is to say, on correct behaviour when in society and when paying devotion to God. As such, *futuwwa* is an *adab* that is all encompassing, and demands continual observance. Sulamī cites the view of Abū Ḥafṣ Nishapūrī that "*Futuwwa* is *ādāb*,"[24] reflecting his observation that "Sufism is made up entirely of *ādāb*". Sulamī's *Kitāb al-futuwwa,* like his *Jawāmīʿ ādāb al-ṣūfiyya* is not a mystical text; his primary aim is to present Sufism as a normative form of Islamic spirituality rather than an innovation or deviant tradition. That some critics regarded Sufism as a distortion of a pure and spiritual manifestation of Islam helps to explain Hujwīrī's

---

21 Mahjoub, "Chivalry and early Persian Sufism," 549–81.
22 Kaykāwūs, *Qābūs-nāma*, 247.
23 A translation of Ḥallāj's understanding of *futuwwa* is found in Sells, *Early Islamic mysticism*, 266–81. Sells uses "valour" to translate *futuwwa*.
24 Sulamī, *Kitāb al-futuwwa*, 305.

citation that "today Sufism is a name without a reality, but formerly it was a reality without a name."[25]

Another reason why some Sufis utilised *futuwwa* to fashion a framework that was synonymous with Sufi *ādāb* is related to attempts to present Sufism as a tradition that was easily comprehensible for the urban people who were already familiar with the ideal behaviour of the brigand or the corporate worker. Yet Sufis such as Sulamī were careful to add a twist of decency to the tradition, as Sufi literature of the time manifests a concern to protect the Sufi movement from the abuses of charlatans who desired to share in what they saw as the benefits that Sufis enjoyed (such as receiving bestowments and influencing notables in society). These abuses explain for the almost repetitive warnings from major Sufis concerning the caution required when deciding which individual to choose as a Sufi guide. Sufis such as Sulamī, Hujwīrī and Abū Ḥāmid Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) attempted to locate Sufism within a system of normative spiritual *ādāb* and thereby offer the tradition some protection during a period that was still relatively close to the era of Ghulām Khalīl (d. 275/888) who persecuted a number of famous Sufis in Baghdad.[26] The continuing caution that Sufis needed to exercise may be evidenced from the persistence of criticisms made against the movement, typified by the condemnation of elements of the tradition expressed by Ibn Jawzī (d. 578/1200) in his *Talbīs Iblīs.*[27] Apologetic Sufi works were composed in the twelfth century by the likes of Ghazālī, whose *Kīmyā–yi saʿādat* is a large work that is composed of four books, the second of which is predominantly about *ādāb.*[28] It follows in the tradition of Sarrāj and Hujwīrī by attempting to locate Sufism within a "normative" Islamic framework. However, the difficulty faced by Ghazālī was related to the need to preserve the "integrity" and "purity" of the tradition while at the same time promoting it among a wider cross section of society. There are clear indications that some Sufi masters desired to provide a way for worldly people to abide by a system of *ādāb* that bridged specifically worldly affairs with those of the Sufi realm.

During Ghazālī's lifetime Sufism was becoming increasingly popular, which was attributable to the development of the *khānqāh* (probably inspired by the example of the Karrāmiyya)[29] which gave the Sufis space to practice their own ritual activities and host not only fully committed individuals but also a large number of "lay–affiliates". This would have included the equivalent of a "soup–kitchen" for the needy and a safe place to stay for travellers. One of the best examples of this is the *khānqāh* of Abū Sa'īd b. Abī l–Khayr (d. 427/1049) where "ordinary people, poor folk and labourers, urban and rural [and] even the most ostracized outcasts of society, such as a wretched young drunkard in one instance" received hospitality.[30] The presence of such lay–affiliates with resident Sufis, and the sheer size of the institution which could cater for up to 120 individuals necessitated a system of rules and regulations for his followers, a new form of Sufi *ādāb.*[31] Moreover, whereas many Sufis had been extremely cautious about permitting the "un–initiated" into specific Sufi rituals, it is reported that Abū Saʿīd encouraged wide

25 Hujwīrī, *Kashf al–maḥjūb*, 59.

26 Ernst, *Words of ecstasy in Sufism*, 97, 99, 101.

27 Margoliouth, "The Devil's delusion."

28 Ghazālī, *Kīmyā–yi saʿādat,* 281–542.

29 Bosworth, "Rise of the Karāmiyyah in Khurasan," 5–14.

30 Graham, "Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī'l–Khayr and the school of Khurāsān," 122.

31 The number of 120 individuals has been estimated by Bertels, *Taṣawwuf wa–adabiyyāt–i taṣawwuf,* 58, cited in Graham, "Abū Saʿīd Abī'l–Khayr," 117. For the ten regulations of Sufi *ādāb*, see Ibn Munawwar, *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness*, 493–5.

participation in Sufi devotions, such as the *samāʿ*.[32] The promotion of a form of Sufism that benefited worldly people who desired some degree of spiritual benefit occurred at a time when the Sufi movement in general had to respond to the difficult situation it had been facing in relation to political power. Whilst the Sufi ideal was to focus on God and promote spirituality within the immediate circle of like–minded seekers, the tradition was at the same time enmeshed within worldly concerns. As a result of the increasing popularity of Sufism it was clearly in the interest of worldly rulers, sultans and local magnates to extend their political legitimacy by associating and allying themselves with those who enjoyed spiritual capital. A number of scholars have indicated how Seljuk, Mamluk and Ayyubid leaders were inclined towards influential Sufis, to the extent that they offered them patronage and built *khānqāh*s, as it was in their interests to support a form of *ādāb*–bound Sufism that promoted order.[33] One of the best examples of this is the *khānqāh* built in Cairo by Saladin in 569/1173, which stipulated that it was to provide for foreign born dervishes, trained in Shāfiʿī or Mālikī *fiqh*, as well as Ashʿarī theology.[34]

The proximity between Sufis and the community at large resulted in some Sufi masters targeting, allowing modifications in the *ādāb* demanded at the *khānqāh* or in meetings. This perfectly illustrated in *Kitāb ādāb al–murīdīn*, by Abū l–Najīb Suhrawardī (d. 546/1168).[35] Like Sarrāj and Hujwīrī, Suhrawardī classified *ādāb* into three groups: *ādāb* for people of the world, for the people of religion, and for the choicest of the people of religion. However, in an attempt to attract the people of the world to the Sufi tradition, Suhrawardī listed up to forty dispensations (*rukhṣa*) by which the lay affiliates were permitted by the Sufi shaykh to refrain from certain activities, the performance of which were essential for full–time Sufis, or else they were permitted to engage in other actions that were forbidden to Sufis. These included the dispensation not only to be present in the *samāʿ*, but to get up and move and dance, to joke, to be engaged in business and to eat delicious food.[36] Whereas in the tenth and eleventh centuries the impetus of Sufi *ādāb* was to establish space for the tradition within "normative" Islam, by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the pressure for a flexible form of *ādāb* came from below, from the like of trades people and merchants.

The extent of intermingling between leading Sufis and worldly people is evident in Aflākī's hagiography of Rūmī (d. 672/1273) whose sessions were attended by ordinary folk, women and *akhīs*, and in the anonymous hagiography of Awḥad al–Dīn Kirmānī (d. 635/1238) there are several examples of him engaging in *samāʿ* with the local population who were not his disciples.[37] But the best example of the increasing attraction that Sufis held for worldly people is the attempt by Abū l–Najīb Suhrawardī's nephew, Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234), to fashion the tradition of *futuwwa* into a kind of second–class Sufism which seems to have been designed specifically for

---

32 Graham, "Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī'l–Khayr," 119–20. For the larger context on *samāʿ*, see Ridgeon "The controversy of Shaykh Awḥad al–Dīn Kirmānī and handsome, moon–faced youths," 3–30. See also Ghazālī's fatwa on the topic included in Pūrjawādī, *Dū mujaddid*, 90.

33 Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 90; Graham, "Abū Saʿīd ibn Abī'l–Khayr," 112–6; Knysh, *Islamic mysticism*, 173; Dabashi, "Historical conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuq period," 137–74.

34 The forthcoming work of Nathan Hofer examines this institution in great detail.

35 Suhrawardī, *A Sufi Rule for Novices*.

36 Suhrawardī, *A Sufi Rule for Novices*, 72–83.

37 Aflākī, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manāqeb al–'ārefīn)* 248, 338; for Kirmānī see the text edited by Furūzānfar, *Manāqib–i Awḥad al–Dīn Ḥāmid Ibn Abī–l–Fakhr–i Kirmānī,* 40–1, 42, 65.

lay people.[38] Suhrawardī's endeavour in this regard may be related to the Caliph's efforts to appropriate the urban *futuwwa* groups in Baghdad that operated as vigilante groups and were at times hardly conducive to harmonious communal living.[39] Be that as it may, Suhrawardī's promotion of these "second–class" Sufi organisations permitted him to advocate his case for a sober form of Sufism in society. His *futuwwat–ādāb* allowed worldly people the opportunity to engage in Sufi–esque devotions and rituals under the supervision of a master who was clearly supposed to be learned not only in Sufism, but also the Holy Law (since he was permitted to issue fatwas). Suhrawardī's *futuwwa–adab* attempted to connect the *ādāb* of general courtesy and civility, with both a legalistic *ādāb* based on the *sharīʿa* and a Sufi *ādāb* which promoted devotional piety and shared Sufi courtesies. A feature of the Sufi–*futuwwat* treatises from the thirteenth century onwards is the emphasis on the correct *ādāb* for initiation (which sometimes included restrictions on membership), the proper *ādāb* for communal living (such as the ritualised gathering for meals), and the appropriate *ādāb* for Sufi ceremonies such as the *samāʿ*. All of this contributed to a sense of cohesion, belonging and solidarity. In many cases this was legitimised with reference to Islamic precedents, which suggests that the authors of the treatises were concerned to teach new adherents the Islamic credentials of *futuwwa* activities. The second class and diluted nature of these works is typified in a *futuwwa* treatise that culls passages, rather than complete chapters on topics such as *samāʿ* and the *ādāb* for communal eating from Ghazālī's *Kīmyā–yi saʿādat*[40]. Although I have termed these associations "second–class Sufi organisations," it is at the same time true that Suhrawardī's treatises demand conformity to the conditions of a total ritualistic regime.

While *ādāb*–bound Sufism enjoyed the patronage of rulers who desired order and stability and thereby were the natural supporters of *ādāb*, there are indications that the relationship between secular rulers and leaders of spiritual movements was not always harmonious. Suhrawardī himself remarked somewhat cryptically that the lodge of *futuwwa* is built with the income from the spiritual masters, whereas the *khānqāh*s of the Sufis are built with the income from kings and princes[41]. Nevertheless, in general the *futuwwa* literature emphasises the rules and regulations of the tradition which suggests that adherents recognised that order was indeed necessary in the tradition. Implicit, however, is the tension inherent in over–regulation that threatened to unravel the organisation.

Alternatives and Alterity

The aim of the Suhrawardīs in opening the *khānqāh* doors was to allow greater participation and perhaps prevent the Sufi tradition from becoming ossified and stale. Yet the inherent danger of this policy was that the movement would become more closely linked with worldly engagements, thereby deviating from the God–centred Sufi life–style. This explains for the stress on *ādāb* in their Sufi and *futuwwat* compositions.

---

38 Ridgeon, *Jawanmardi,* 25–41.
39 Salinger, "Was the *futuwa* an oriental form of chivalry?" and Zakeri, "The *futuwwa*–'House' at the time of the Caliph al–Nasir," 222–37.
40 Ridgeon, *Jawanmardi*, 138–46.
41 Ridgeon, *Jawanmardi*, 58.

Along with the growth of Sufi–*futuwwa*, the tradition of normative Sufism continued, and this is apparent in the kinds of treatises that are typified by Abū Ḥafṣ Suhrawardī's *ʿAwārif al–maʿārif* which promoted a sober and rule–bound version of spirituality in which copious attention was paid to correct *ādāb*[42]. Similar works that were concerned with the preservation of a regime of *ādāb* that regulated and ritualised the smallest details of communal behaviour for the Sufi in a *khānqāh* include a *risāla* by the thirteenth century Persian speaking Sufi, ʿAzīz Nasafī entitled "Explaining the *Ādāb* of the Sufis."[43] Nasafī elaborated on rituals of prayer, travelling and *ādāb* in the *khānqāh*; the latter included specific rulings such as entering the *khānqāh* with the right foot first and leaving with the left foot, not speaking or reading books with a loud voice and walking silently so as to not disturb other dervishes' concentration, regulations that were designed to solve disputes between *khānqāh* inhabitants, conventions of a Junaydian nature for the correct performance of the *samāʿ*, and rules on approved table–manners.[44] In short Nasafī offered a rigidly formal regime of Sufi *ādāb* which might have been considered excessively dry and unappealing to the emerging numbers of "deviant dervishes" who were seeking to express new forms of piety.

The Sufi tradition has often been associated by its opponents with antinomian expressions of experience or non–conformist ways of behaviour that were more conducive to individualistic rather than communal forms of living. (Early examples of this include the individuals associated with the Malāmatiyya). Those who sought such a lifestyle were known under the general rubric of "Qalandar", typified in a literary genre known as *qalandariyyāt*[45]. Qalandarism was manifested by individuals who either completely rejected society or those who revealed certain forms of antinomian behaviour, such as Shams–i Tabrīzī (d. 645/1247)[46]. In addition, it is intriguing that both Suhrawardī and Nasafī provided hints of the existence of such seekers who sought their spiritual life outside of normative Sufi *ādāb,* which was being pulled into the orbit of a more worldly orientation for the reasons suggested above by the thirteenth century. Suhrawardī described an individual who was separated from others (*tajrīd*), lived in seclusion (*tafrīd*) in the level of singularity (*tawḥīd*) and was absolved from certain conditions pertaining to formal *ādāb.*[47] Likewise, Nasafī mentioned a type of perfect person who fled from association with people.[48] Unfortunately these vague allusions to individuals who lived outside of society, and perhaps beyond the terrain that necessitated "social" *ādāb*, do not permit an explicit association with types of deviant dervishes that have been categorised as Qalandars. Yet it is interesting that the two individuals (and their immediate followers) who have been regarded as the inspiration for the social phenomenon of Qalandarism (as opposed to the simple literary trope) appeared around the same time that Suhrawardī and Nasafī composed their treatises.

---

42 Ohlander, *Sufism in an Age of Transition.* For Suhrawardī and *ādāb* see Huda, *Striving for Divine Union,* 62–72.

43 Nasafī, *Kitāb al–insān al–kāmil,* 120–30, lists eight *ādāb*, the first seven of which outlined the correct performance of prayer, while the eighth endorsed travelling (*safar*).

44 Nasafī, *Kitāb al–insān al–kāmil*, 120–30.

45 Pratt–Ewing, *Arguing sainthood*, 230–52. De Bruin, "The Qalandariyyāt in Persian mystical poetry, from Sanā'ī onwards," 75–86.

46 Lewis, *Rumi: Past and Present, East and West,* 135; Shams–i Tabrīzī's individualistic and antinomian tendencies are evident in his own writings, see his "autobiography," the so–called *Maqālāt–i Shams*, which has been translated by Chittick as *Me and Rumi*.

47 Ridgeon, *Jawanmardi*, 83.

48 Nasafī, *Kitāb al–insān al–kāmil*, 9.

These two proto–type Qalandars were Jamāl al–Dīn Sāwī (d.ca. 630/1232–33)[49] and Quṭb al–Dīn Ḥaydar (d.ca. 618/1221–22), who both fled from society and adopted lives of seclusion (the former in graveyards while the latter preferred mountainside retreats).[50] Moreover, the usual Sufi *ādāb* were abandoned, typified by the rejection of the Sufi *khirqa*; Jamāl al–Dīn Sāwī is presented as having a preference for nakedness or later for heavy woollen garments, while Quṭb al–Dīn Ḥaydar clothed himself in leaves. In addition, they both had unconventional ways of styling their facial hair; Jamāl al–Dīn Sāwī is attributed with the so–called "four shaves" (*chahār ẓarb*), while Quṭb al–Dīn Ḥaydar may have shaved his beard but let his moustache grow, and he may have sported long hair locks.[51]

Karamustafa's analysis of the growth of these kinds of dervish groups rests upon the hypothesis that "the entrenchment of Sufism in society in the form of ubiquitous social institutions refranchised the dormant otherworldly trends of renunciation and anarchist individualism within Sufism."[52] In other words, it is possible that the appearance of deviant dervishes was motivated by the formalisation of Sufi *ādāb*, the lack of individualism and a desire for more intense piety and spiritual poverty. The "four shaves" are indicative of this,[53] as the existing literature on the topic associates shaving facial hair with the ritual of shaving during the *ḥajj* that is connected with Q 48:27. In effect, the rationale behind the shaves was a symbolic presentation of the individual in a state of purity before God. Likewise, the manifestation of variant modes of clothing may be considered a return to primal states of existence. While the ideal may have been to focus on purity and piety, at the same time it is likely that there were individuals or groups associated with the Qalandar that deviated from this, resulting in the rejection of the Qalandar movement by many. Suhrawardī is a case in point, as he claims that "they respect no custom or usage and reject the regular observances of society and mutual relationship [...] they concern themselves little with ritual prayer and fasting except such as are obligatory."[54] In his recent work Green is more forthright in his remark that, "whether through strolling around naked, openly using drugs and alcohol, or torturing their bodies with spikes and chains, the *qalandars* deliberately rejected all social norms in a way that was antithetical to the conformist Sufi mainstream."[55] In addition he discusses the context in which such groups emerge, for the Mongol period in Central Asia, Anatolia and Iran resulted in a weakening of traditional religious authority that permitted the development of new modes of spiritual expression which may have borrowed elements of Shamanism. The spread of such forms of Sufism that had alternative *ādāb* had much to do with changing patterns of patronage, and the "vernacularization of Sufi teachings" that permitted Turkish and other languages outside of the "sophisticated" Arabic and Persian traditions to express Sufi spirituality to the less classically educated. In Green's words "we are dealing here with wilder, charismatic

---

49 Khaṭīb Fārisī, *Qalandar nāma–yi Khaṭīb Fārisī*.

50 For Jamāl al–Dīn Sāwī see Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 39–44; for Quṭb al–Dīn Ḥaydar see *ibid*, 44–6.

51 The *chahār ẓarb* involved the removal of head hair, eyebrows, moustache and beard. For Jamāl al–Dīn Sāwī and hair see Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 43–4; for Quṭb al–Dīn Ḥaydar the information is less precise and relies on the assumption that groups of Qalandars known as Ḥaydarīs copied his example. See *ibid*, 44–6.

52 Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 99.

53 Ridgeon, "Shaggy or shaved," 233–63.

54 Cited in Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, 267.

55 Green, *Sufism*, 80. The reference to spiking bodies and the use of chains (for self–flagellation?) is a reference to some Sufis (particularly of the Rifāʿī order) who became infamous for their antinomian practices that included eating live snakes, entering ovens, rolling in fire and eating it. See Trimingham, *The Sufi orders in Islam*, 38–9.

figures more likely to be seen wearing the skins and horns of animals than the plain cloak and turban of the scholar."[56]

Accommodation

The very first generation of deviant dervishes witnessed the difficulties in maintaining their individualistic piety. As Jamāl al–Dīn Sāwī was obliged to accept a group of followers, his individualistic *ādāb* was reformed to the extent that his nakedness was now concealed beneath woollen garments. Moreover, the tendency for Qalandars to congregate in groups (rather than preserve an isolated, individual existence) is illustrated in the famous (but perhaps apocryphal) story of Fakhr al–Dīn 'Irāqī (d. 688/1289) who became enraptured with a young Qalandar male, whilst studying within the *madrasa* in Hamadān, and immediately left to join this band of itinerants.[57] Although some of these Qalandar *ādāb* placed adherents outside of "normative" Sufism, many of the rituals and devotions of the former were borrowed from the latter tradition, including practices associated with purity, self–denial, control of the *nafs*, travelling, the need to follow a guide, and specific body coverings. The Qalandar adoption of a "mirror" image from the Sufis for their own faith and practice was a reaction to the continuing formalisation of Sufi *ādāb*. The increasing ritualisation of Sufi *ādāb* (which may have been a result of the development of specific orders with their focus on particular ritual activity) is evident in the well–known treatises of Abū l–Mafākhīr Yaḥyā Bākharzī (d. 736/1335–6) and 'Izz al–Dīn Kāshānī (d. 735/1356–7). The former composed a work entitled *Awrād al–aḥbāb wa–fuṣūṣ al–ādāb* ("The Litany of the Lovers and the Ring–Stones of Manners"). This second part of this work ("The Ring–Stones of Manners") is over 350 pages in the edited version and is composed of chapters discussing the correct performance of Sufi rituals and spiritual attitudes in great detail and precision. The 434 pages of Kāshānī's *Miṣbāḥ al–hidāya* is divided into ten sections, each of which has ten chapters[58], and of significance is the sixth and longest section, entitled "On *Ādāb*" which focuses in particular on the relationship between the shaykh and his disciple, travelling, eating, and clothing.[59] These kinds of works contributed to the perpetuation of what might be considered a sober, *sharīʿa*–minded form of Sufi *ādāb* which in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries existed alongside the "second–class" Sufi–*futuwwa* groups.

The sober, *sharīʿa*–minded form of Sufism thrived in the Mongol and post–Mongol periods, and this is neatly illustrated in the works that were composed by Ḥusayn Wāʿīz Kāshifī (d. 1504), who is commonly associated with the Naqshbandī order. Interestingly, Kāshifī was also the author of the most comprehensive of treatises on *futuwwa*, namely, the *Futuwwat–nāma–yi sulṭānī.* While the book does contain much information on *futuwwa*, Kāshifī also included abundant material about Sufi material culture, such as the different kinds of robes and headware that was current among the dervishes of his age, and the symbolism of the shapes, materials and colours of these items.[60] This must have represented to some the external trappings of a spirituality that had been lost—

---

56 Green, *Sufism*, 101.

57 Chittick, "ʿErāqī, Fakr al–dīn Ebrāhīm."

58 This work has often described as a Persian reworking of Suhrawardī's *'Awārif al–ma'ārif.* See the brief discussion of this in Chittick, "*'Awārif al–ma'ārif.*"

59 Kāshānī, *Miṣbāḥ al–hidāya*, 203–83.

60 Kāshifī, *The Royal Book of Spiritual Chivalry*, 177–94.

indeed, sartorial *ādāb* is far removed from the concerns of the Malāmatīs of tenth century Khurāsān. And the *futuwwa* associations endorsed this formalised ritual activity—indeed, the idealised version that was delineated by Suhrawardī described how a nasal hair had to be removed if it protruded from the nose.[61] Suhrawardī also insisted that the *futuwwa* brothers appear in smart and clean garments, again, a stark contrast to the Malāmatīs who liked to wear the clothes of tradespeople.[62] The *ādāb* of *futuwwa* also encompassed regulations for initiation, rules for polite table manners, requirement to overlook the brothers' sins, generosity and magnanimity. Ontological and esoteric understandings of *tawḥīd* are not features that seem to have concerned the *futuwwa* brothers: of greater importance was the social bond between members which necessitated clearly demarcated rules and regulations. This explains why *futuwwa* literature usually includes sections on who may be admitted into the group and the necessary attributes that such a person must possess.[63]

Unsurprisingly, deviant groups of dervishes flourished in the post–Mongol period. An example of such a Qalandar is Otman Bābā, who rejected the sober, *sharīʿa*–minded form of Sufism and the masters of such institutions. He attracted a following of several hundred dervishes and had good relations with the Ottoman sultan Meḥmed II.[64] Other examples of Qalandar groups in the period between the thirteenth and sixteenth century abound.[65] It is noteworthy too that in this period, the great Persian poet Ḥāfiz posits the "*rend*s and *qalandars* as the very embodiment of virtue and piety,"[66] while Sufis are described as "dishonest and deceitful and whose cloaks of poverty are stained by the secretly forbidden wine."[67] Yet by the beginning of the sixteenth century, the centralising political rule of the emerging Ottomans and Safavids were to put an end to the largely uncontrolled tradition of *futuwwa*, and many Sufi groups suffered as a result of the perception that they challenged rulers and monarchs. This did not mean an end to the Sufi orders, for acquiescent shaykhs were useful to the aspirations of the new political realities. Indeed, in Ottoman territories the state manipulated certain Sufi orders, such as the Bektashis, and bound them within its sphere of control.[68] Even so, the tensions inherent between secular and Sufi reappeared with regularity.[69]

However, semi–independent *futuwwa* groups and ecstatic and uncontrollable forms of messianic Sufism were not tolerated.[70] What was required was a strictly *ādāb*–bound version of Sufism that was prepared to recognise the new political configuration. It is ironic that Qalandar groups in Iran benefitted from political centralisation and control, for while the major Sunni–Sufi orders were either expelled, repressed or persuaded by the new monarchical–clerical alliance to realign their denominational preferences in Shi'ite Iran, the Shi'ite Ḥaydarī Qalandars appear to have profited from state patronage in ritually cursing the Sunni tradition.[71] It remains to be proven,

---

61 Ridgeon, *Jawanmardi*, 84

62 Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, 41.

63 Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, 74–90.

64 Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 46–9

65 Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 51–84.

66 Yarshater, *"Hafez: An overview,"* 461–5.

67 Yarshater, *"Hafez: An overview,"* 461–5.

68 Doja, "A political history of Bektashism," 423–50.

69 Curry, "The meeting of the two sultans," 223–42.

70 Bashir, *Messianic Hopes and Mystical Visions.*

71 Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, 144. However it seems that there may have been some disquiet among the Qalandars to Safavid centralisation. See the four Qalandar–led uprisings within the Safavid realm in 1588, and reported in Iskandar Munshī, *The history of Shah 'Abbas the Great*, 132–3.

however, the extent to which Qalandar associations remained as distinct antinomian dervish groups during the Safavid period, and whether they merged into urban centres and adopted trades and occupations which had their own particular forms of *ādāb*.

The latter is worthy of consideration, especially in light of the theory that connects the Qalandar with specific trades, many of which had their own specific *ādāb* that were elaborated within occupational treatises, also known as *futuwwat–nāma*s[72]. The Qalandar have been linked with barbers because both groups shared the emphasis on the tools of the trade (scissors, mirror and whet–stone), indeed, the Qalandar have been considered as inheritors of the trades–people, that is to say, the *jawānmardān*, or the members of the *futuwwa* associations.[73] The content of these occupational treatises reflects a high degree of similarity with earlier works on *futuwwat* from the thirteenth–fifteenth centuries. These include forms of initiation, mythic history and literary style.[74] With the weakening of the *futuwwa* and *akhī* institutions in the sixteenth century, it appears that craft and trade associations emerged as natural successors to Sufi–style *futuwwa*, and continued many of the *futuwwa ādāb* (correct external behaviour and appropriate spiritual attitudes). However, the establishment of guilds in the domains of the Safavids ensured that the *ādāb* of the crafts and occupational associations were regulated in a system that was overseen by a state official. In this way, the *ādāb* were respectable and conformed to a sober and non–ecstatic variety of spiritual expression.

Outside of the terrain of the Safavid state, it appears that there were also some Qalandars that conformed to a more conventional form of *ādāb*. This is typified in a treatise known as *Ādāb al–ṭarīq,*[75] which was composed in 1050/1672 in the region of Bukhara by a certain Ḥajjī ʻAbd al–Raḥīm. The work is composed of twelve chapters which investigate the material culture of the Qalandar: thus there are chapters on the hat, the hair, the cloak, the belt, the staff, the begging bowl, the pumpkin–pot, the table (*sufra*), service, the animal skin, the broom and different clothes of poverty. The author clearly identifies the path as pertaining to the Qalandars, yet at the same time he refers reverently to Shāh Naqshband[76] and calls the Khwājagān the best of all [Sufi] orders.[77] The combination of Qalandarī and Naqshbandī associations appears rather unusual, especially as their own respective forms of *ādāb* are more commonly perceived to be quite different. To take one example, the Qalandars are visually distinct because of their practice of the four shaves, whereas this is not associated with the Naqshbandīs. Yet Ḥajjī ʻAbd al–Raḥīm only discusses the shaving of the head, and he admits that letting the hair grow was the practice of Muḥammad, even though shaving the head was also the *Sunna* (justified with reference to Q 48:27). The attempt to bridge the divide between the traditions of the Qalandars and the Naqshbandīs appears to veer heavily towards a sober–based, *sharīʿa*–minded Sufism. In his closing comments on the chapter concerning head hair, he comments, "Know that the purpose of this discussion is guidance for seekers and wayfarers of the path so that they do not step out of the prophetic *sharīʿa*

---

[72] Gevorgyan, "*Futuwwa* varieties and the *futuwwat–nāma* literature."

73 This theory has been argued by Mihrān Afshārī, and is summarised in Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, 133–5.

[74] This refers to the origin of the occupation and spiritualised employment of the tools of trade. See for example the last two chapters of Kāshifī, *The Royal Book of Spiritual Chivalry*, 269–497.

75 I possess copies of two manuscripts of this treatise. The first is kept in the Majlis Library, Tehran (manuscript number 1055) but actually bears the title "Lords of the way" (*arbāb al–ṭarīq*). The second manuscript is entitled *Ādāb al–ṭarīq* and is kept in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg (manuscript number B946). The two manuscripts are virtually the same; the major difference is the title, which is most the result of a scribal error.

[76] Ḥajjī ʻAbd al–Raḥīm Majlis library 1055, fol.38.

[77] Ḥajjī ʻAbd al–Raḥīm Majlis library 1055, fol. 29.

but engage in ascetic discipline: '*Ādāb is a hat of divine light/ Place it on your head and wander wherever you wish'.* The prophet said, *Ādāb* is a command of God, the Most High."[78] This esteem for the *sharīʿa* is not an isolated instance, as there are many other references that indicate that the author endorsed a version of Qalandarī–Naqshbandī Sufism that he believed was rooted firmly in conventional *ādāb*. Most of the chapters describing the material culture of the dervish pivot around discussions of the origins and spiritual meanings of the various implements (which parallels that found in the occupational treatises)[79] in a fashion that even the most "conservative" Naqshbandī would probably have found unproblematic.

I do not wish to suggest that from the seventeenth century onwards the unconventional forms of Sufism simply ceased to exist (indeed, the literature indicates that this was not the case).[80] What I am arguing is that it is possible to trace a tendency towards the sanitisation and domestication of some deviant groups, which was complemented by the weakening of the Sufi–*futuwwa* associations, whose energies were most likely channelled into occupational associations (which continued to be inspired, however, by Sufi teachings). While Shi'ite Qalandar groups seem to have survived the general onslaught against Sufism during the Safavid period,[81] it is likely too, that their *ādāb* needed to be adjusted to reflect the socio–political changes. A similar process occurred in some Ottoman territories, where the Kadizadeli movement assisted the rulers to regulate Sufi orders and antinomian, devious dervish tendencies.[82] In fact, the pressure and tendency to conform and integrate into the sober, *sharīʿa*–minded Sufi orders existed at the very birth of the Qalandar movement in the thirteenth century and continued until the weakening of such movements in the seventeenth century.[83] The success of Qalandars in resisting these demands depended on the frailness of centralising forces, and by the seventeenth century the authority and ability of the Ottoman and Safavid states to implement a policy of religious conformity was far greater than the centripetal forces of earlier periods.

Conclusion

This diachronic study of Sufi *ādāb* has examined the changing nature of the concept with reference to the socio–political context of Sufism in general within Persianate territories from the emergence of the early masters such as Sarrāj in the tenth century to the formation of powerful and centralised states in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The hypothesis herein rests upon a dialectic development of Sufism. This commences with Sufi apologetics, the success of which resulted in a greater degree of popularisation and political patronage. The appeal of Sufism may be witnessed in the emergence of the Sufi–*futuwwa* movement, which was a form of "second–class" Sufism for the masses that became widespread by the thirteenth century in Iran and Anatolia. At the same time,

78 Ḥajjī 'Abd al–Raḥīm Majlis library 1055, fol. 38.

79 The best example of this is found in Kāshifī, *Futuwwat–nāma–yi sulṭānī*. English translation by Crook, *The royal book of spiritual chivalry*, 269–380.

80 See the remarks of the Russian traveller to Isfahan in the mid–seventeenth century relating to the debauch and corrupt nature of the Qalandars, cited in Ridgeon, *Manners and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, 133.

81 Arjomand, "Religious extremism (*ghuluww*), Ṣūfism and Sunnism in Safavid Iran," 1–35.

82 Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis," 251–69.

83 Watenpaugh, "Deviant dervishes," 552.

there was growing rigidity within certain understandings of Sufi *ādāb*. The increasing levels of popular participation on the one hand and escalating formality in *ādāb* on the other helps to explain for the rise of "deviant dervishes", or Qalandars, whose antinomian behaviour rejected the prescribed structures of *ādāb*, and who also desired a more intensive form of spiritual expression. However, the pressures of political persuasion and centralising forces caused many within these antinomian movements to conform to a more domesticated and sober form of Sufi expression which endorsed traditional Sufi *ādāb*. In short, the dialectic moves from apologetics to alternatives and alterity to accommodation. All of these developments are evident within Sufi writings that portray the appropriate form of *ādāb*.

A focus upon Sufi *ādāb* from its formative period until the very beginning of the modern period in the sixteenth century offers a dialectic that does not differ fundamentally from the views of other scholars who have traced the historical trajectory of Sufism.[84] However, the concept of *ādāb* within the Sufi tradition provides a useful yardstick by which it is possible to analyse the various movements and manifestations. It is dangerous to essentialise a classical form of Sufi *ādāb* that persisted from the formative period of the tenth century and lasted in a pristine fashion until the sixteenth century. That there were controversies and challenges to "normative *ādāb*" is typified in the discussions and practice of the *samāʿ*, which ranged from Ghazālī's caution, to Rūmī's more open and ecstatic performance, and further to the supposed homoerotic practices of Kirmānī. However, the persistence of a sober, *sharīʿa*–minded Sufi *ādāb*, represented by the continuing popularity of works by scholars such as Ghazālī and Suhrawardī, indicates that there was indeed a standard of belief and practice that persisted within some Sufi circles during the period in question. Such an essential foundation of Sufi *ādāb*, and the challenges posed to it by alternative forms of spirituality resembles Ernest Gellner's theory of the cyclical pattern of state–formation or dynasty initiation.[85] Gellner argued that when "High Islam" (represented by the scholars, reason, order and sobriety) struggled for its enforcement, it was "Low Islam" (comprised of the uneducated tribes and masses who were more inclined to ecstasy than rule observance) that was used by rulers to enforce or clean up the corruption.[86] And when Low Islam had succeeded in temporarily routing High Islam, it conformed to the strictures of "orthodoxy" and High Islam became the standard once more. While there are some difficulties with Gellner's theory,[87] the parallel between High Islam and Low Islam with "sober Sufism" and "deviant dervishes", and the movement within Sufism from apologetic to alterity to accommodation spring readily to mind.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Aflākī. *The feats of the knowers of God (Manāqeb al–'ārefīn)*. Translated by John J. O'Kane. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

[84] Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*; Green, *Sufism*.

[85] Gellner, *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion*, 13.

[86] Gellner, *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion*, 11–13.

[87] The distinction between "High Islam" and "Low Islam" is problematic, although Gellner does acknowledge that the boundaries between then are not precise.

Bākharzī, Abū'l–Mafākhīr Yaḥyā. *Awrād al–aḥbāb wa–fuṣūṣ al–ādāb.* Edited by Iraj Afshār. Tehran: Intishārāt–i dānishgāh–i Tehrān, 1979.

Ghazālī, Abū Ḥāmid. *Kīmyā–yi sa'ādat*. Edited by Ḥusayn Khadīw–jam. Tehran: Intishārāt–i 'ilmī wa farhangī, 1361/1983.

Ḥajjī 'Abd al–Raḥīm. *Ādāb al–ṭarīq.* MS *Arbāb al–ṭarīq,* Majlis Library, Tehran (manuscript number 1055) and MS *Ādāb al–ṭarīq*, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg (manuscript number B946).

Hujwīrī. *Kashf al–maḥjūb*. Edited by Maḥmūd 'Abidī. Tehran: Surūsh, 1386/2007.

Ibn Munawwar. *The secrets of God's mystical oneness [Asrār Al–Towḥid].* Translated by John O'Kane. Costa Mesa: Mazda, 1992.

Iskandar Munshī Kāshānī, 'Izz al–Dīn. *Miṣbāḥ al–hidāya*. Edited by Jalāl Humā'ī. Tehran: Kitābkhāna–yi Sanā'ī, n.d.

Kāshifī, Ḥusayn Wā'iẓ. *Futuwwat–nāma–yi sulṭānī*. Edited by Moḥammad J. Maḥjūb. Tehran: Bunyād–i farhang–i Irān, 1971.

Kāshifī, Ḥusayn Wā'iẓ. *The Royal Book of Spiritual Chivalry*. Translated by Jay R. Crook. Chicago: Great Books of the Islamic World, Inc, 2000.

Kaykāwūs Ibn Washmgīr ibn Ziyār. *Qābūs–nāma.* Edited by Ghulām Ḥusayn Yūsufī. Tehran: Intishārāt–i 'ilmī wa farhangī, 1373/1994–5.

Manāqib–i Awḥad al–Dīn Ḥāmid Ibn–i Abi al–Fakhr–i Kirmānī. Edited by Badī' al–Zamān Furūzānfar. Tehran: BNTK, 1969.

Me and Rumi: the autobiography of Shams–i Tabrizi. Translated by William C. Chittick. Louisville, Kentucky: Fons Vitae, 2004.

Nasafī, 'Azīz. *Kitāb al–insān al–kāmil*. Edited by Marijan Molé. Tehran, 1968.

Sarrāj, Abū Naṣr. *Kitāb al–luma' fī'l–taṣawwuf*. Edited by 'Abd al–Ḥalīm Maḥmūd and Ṭaha 'Abd al–Bāqī Surūr. Cairo: Dār al–Kutub al–ḥadītha, 1380/1960.

Suhrawardī, Abū l–Najīb. *Adab al–murīdīn*. Translated by Menahem Milson as *A Sufi rule for novices*. Harvard University Press, 1975.

Sulamī. *A collection of Sufi rules of conduct.* Translated by Elena Biagi. Cambridge: The Islamic Texts Society, 2010.

Sulami. *La lucidité implacable* (*risālat al–malāmatiyya*). Translated by Roger Deladrière. Paris: Arléa, 1999.

The history of Shah 'Abbas the great. Translated by Robert Savory. Boulder: Westview Press, 1978.

Secondary literature

Arjomand, Saïd Amir. "Religious extremism (*ghuluww*), Ṣūfism and Sunnism in Safavid Iran: 1501–1722." *Journal of Asian History* 15/1 (1981): 1–35.

Bashir, Shahzad. *Messianic hopes and mystical visions: The Nūrbakhshīya between medieval and modern Iran*. Chapel Hill: University of South Carolina Press, 2003.

Bertels, Yevgenyi E. *Taṣawwuf wa adabiyyāt–i taṣawwuf*. Translated by Sīrūs Izadī. Tehran, 1977.

Bosworth, Edward. "Rise of the Karāmiyyah in Khurasan." *The Muslim World* 50, 1 (1960): 5–14.

Chabbi, Jacqueline. "Remarques sur le développement historique des mouvements ascétiques et mystiques au Khurasan." *Studia Islamica* 46 (1977): 5–72.

Chittick, William. "'Erāqī, Fak̲r al–dīn Ebrāhīm." *Encyclopaedia Iranica,* edited by Ehsan Yarshater. Accessed online June 23, 2016. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/eraqi.

Curry, John J. "The meeting of the two sultans: Three Sufi mystics negotiate with the court of Murād III." In *Sufism and Society: Arrangements of the mystical in the Muslim world, 1200–1800*, edited by John Curry and Erik Ohlander, 223–242. London: Routledge, 2012.

Dabashi, Hamid. "Historical conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuq period." In *Classical Persian Sufism: from its origins to Rumi*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 137–74. London, KPI, 1993.

De Bruin, Jan T.P. “The Qalandariyyāt in Persian mystical poetry, from Sanā’ī onwards.” In *The heritage of Sufism: The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150–1500)*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 75–86. Oxford: Oneworld, 1999.

Doja, Albert. “A political history of Bektashism from Ottoman Anatolia to contemporary Turkey.” *Journal of Church and State*, 48/2 (2006): 423–50.

Ernst, Carl. *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1985.

Gellner, Ernest. *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Gevorgyan, Khachik. “*Futuwwa* varieties and the *futuwwat–nāma* literature.” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 40/1 (2013), 2–13.

Graham, Terry. “Abū Sa’īd Abī’l–Khayr and the School of Khurāsān.” In *Classical Persian Sufism: from its origins to Rumi*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 83–135. London: KPI, 1993.

Green, Nile. *Sufism: a global history*. Chichester: Wiley–Blackwell, 2012.

Huda, Qamarul. *Striving for Divine Union: Spiritual exercises for Suhraward sūfis*. London: Routledge, 2003.

Karamustafa, Ahmet. *God’s Unruly Friends*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2006.

Karamustafa, Ahmet. *Sufism in the formative period.* Edinburgh: University Press, 2007.

Khaleghi–Motlagh, Djalal. “Adab, i. Adab in Iran.” In *Encyclopaedia Iranica,* edited by Ehsan Yarshater, 1982, I: 432–439, accessed online 29 November 2015. http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/adab–i–iran

Khalil, Atif. “Abū Ṭālib al–Makkī and *the nourishment of hearts* (*Qūt al–qulūb*) in the context of early Sufism.” *The Muslim World* 102/2 (2011): 335–56.

Knysh, Alexander. *Islamic Mysticism*. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Lewis, Franklin. *Rumi: Past and Present, East and West.* Oxford: Oneworld, 2003.

Mahjoub, Mohammad J. “Chivalry and early Persian Sufism.” In *Classical Persian Sufism: from its origins to Rumi*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 549-581. [London: KPI, 1993] Oxford: Oneworld, 1999.

Meier, Fritz. “Khurāsān and the end of classical Sufism.” In *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism*, edited by Fritz Meier and translated by John O’Kane, 190–9. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Metcalf, Barbara D. “Introduction.” In *Moral Conduct and Authority: the Place of Adab in South Asian Islam*, edited by Barbara Metcalf, 1–20. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Ohlander, Erik. “Adab, d) in Ṣūfism,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE,* edited by Kate Fleet, Gudrun Krämer, Denis Matringe, John Nawas, Everett Rowson. Brill Online, 2014, accessed on June 23, 2016. http://referenceworks.brillonline.com.ezproxy.univ-paris3.fr/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-3/adab-d-in-sufism-COM_22733?s.num=4&s.f.s2_parent=s.f.book.encyclopaedia-of-islam-3&s.q=Adab

Ohlander, Erik. *Sufism in an Age of Transition: ‘Umar al–Suhrawardī and the rise of the Islamic mystical brotherhoods.* Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Pratt–Ewing, Katherine. *Arguing Sainthood: modernity, psychoanalysis and Islam*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1997.

Pūrjawādī, Naṣrallāh. *Dū mujaddid*. Tehran: Nashr–i Dānishgāh, 2002.

Qushayrī*. Qushayri’s epistle on Sufism*. Translated by Alexander Knysh. Reading: Garnet, 2007.

Ridgeon, Lloyd. “Shaggy or shaved: The symbolism of hair among Persian qalandar Sufis.” *Iran and the Caucuses,* 14 (2010): 233-264.

Ridgeon, Lloyd. *Jawanmardī: A Sufi Code of Honour*. Edinburgh: University Press, 2012.

Ridgeon, Lloyd. *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Ridgeon, Lloyd. “The controversy of Shaykh Awḥad al–Dīn Kirmānī and handsome, moon–faced youths: A case study of *shāhid–bāzī* in Medieval Sufism.” *Journal of Sufi studies* 1, 1 (2012): 3–30.

Salinger, Gerald. “Was the *futuwwa* an oriental form of chivalry?” *Proceedings of the American philosophical society* 94, 5 (1950): 481–93.

Sells, Michael. *Early Islamic Mysticism: Sufi, Qur’ān, mi’raj, poetic and theological writings*. New York: Paulist Press, 1996.

Silvers–Alario, Laury. "The teaching relationship in early Sufism: A re–assessment of Fritz Meier's definition of the *shaykh al–tarbiya* and the *shaykh al–ta'lim*." *The Muslim World* 93 (2003): 69–97.